

REMARKS

In response to the Official Action mailed September 12, 2003, Applicant amends his application and requests reconsideration. In this Amendment, no claims are added or canceled so that claims 1-10 remain pending. No new matter has been added.

It appears that the Examiner has interpreted "number of steps" to be executed in examined claims 1 and 6 to mean a plurality of steps. However, the reference is clearly to the quantity of steps. Accordingly, claims 1 and 6 are amended to clarify that the priority definition level storage means stores the quantity of steps, e.g. "5", and not a plurality of steps (see page 10, lines 4-7 of the patent application). This number, i.e., quantity, is then used by the scenario analysis processing means as a quantified limit when determining which of the steps of a text scenario are to be executed (see page 13, line 11 to page 14, line 13 of the patent application). The clarification of claims 1 and 6 is effected by removing confusing occurrences of "a number of steps" in examined claims 1 and 6 and substituting a more precise word. All other claim amendments simply improve the grammar and format of the claims.

By storing the number of steps executable in response to a start-up, the invention can limit the number of steps of each text scenario that are executed in response to a start-up. Thus, the invention achieves pseudo-multitasking by switching to a task of next-highest priority once the number of scenario steps permitted to be executed are executed (see page 16, lines 10-23 of the patent application).

Claims 1 and 6 were rejected as unpatentable over Coleman et al. (U.S. Patent 4,562,436, hereinafter Coleman) in view of Redford et al. (U.S. Patent 4,692,858, hereinafter Redford). That rejection is respectfully traversed.

The combination of Coleman and Redford fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended claims 1 and 6. Namely, *a priority level definition storage means for storing quantity of steps executable in response to a single start-up* is neither taught nor suggested. It appears that the Official Action is construing the "task" of Coleman and Redford as the "scenario" of amended claims 1 and 6. Accordingly, Coleman discloses scheduling tasks in order of priority, but fails to teach or suggest storing a quantity of steps for each task. (see column 23, lines 22-23 of Coleman). Applicant notes that Coleman does not discuss tasks as being comprised of steps. Thus, the Official Action cannot rely upon Coleman to suggest a storage means storing a quantity of steps for a task.

Redford discloses a task definition record 48, including a command string field 48d (see Figure 2(c) of Redford). However, Redford does not disclose a storage means for storing the quantity of commands in the command string field 48d. Accordingly, the

combination of Coleman and Redford fails to teach or suggest means for storing the quantity of steps in a scenario, as recited by amended claims 1 and 6.

Furthermore, the combination fails to teach determining which steps of the scenario are to be executed. The Official Action acknowledges that this feature is not taught by Coleman, but contends that Redford discloses a method for executing steps associated with a scenario. Redford does disclose that a task definition record 48 includes a command field string 48d (see Figure 2(c) of Redford). Redford also discloses that tasks specified by the command field string 48d (steps) are performed in response to a cursor position (see column 33, lines 20-31 of Redford). However, Redford does not disclose determining which of the tasks (steps) is to be executed, since Redford merely executes all of the tasks (steps) specified by the command field string 48d (see column 33, lines 20-31 of Redford). Thus, the combination of Coleman and Redford also fails to teach or suggest determining which steps of a selected scenario are to be executed, as recited by amended claims 1 and 6.

Because the combination of Coleman and Redford fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended claims 1 and 6, the rejection of amended claims 1 and 6 should be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 7 were rejected as unpatentable over Coleman in view of Redford and further in view of Kawano et al. (U.S. Patent 5,511,167 hereinafter Kawano). That rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Official Action relies upon Coleman and Redford to teach or suggest the limitations of amended claims 1 and 6, from which claims 2 and 7 respectively depend. Accordingly, the propriety of the rejection of claims 2 and 7 depends upon the propriety of the rejection of amended claims 1 and 6. Because the rejection of amended claims 1 and 6 is erroneous, and because Kawano fails to teach or suggest those limitations of amended claims 1 and 6 absent from Coleman and Redford, the rejection of claims 2 and 7 is also erroneous and should be withdrawn.

Claims 3 and 8 were rejected as unpatentable over Coleman in view of Redford and further in view of Hough (U.S. Patent 4,604,694). That rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Official Action relies upon Coleman and Redford to teach or suggest the limitations of amended claims 1 and 6, from which claims 3 and 8 respectively depend. Accordingly, the propriety of the rejection of claims 3 and 8 depends upon the propriety of the rejection of amended claims 1 and 6. Because the rejection of amended claims 1 and 6 is erroneous, and because Hough fails to teach or suggest those limitations of amended claims 1 and 6 absent from Coleman and Redford, the rejection of claims 3 and 8 is also erroneous and should be withdrawn.

Claims 4 and 9 were rejected as unpatentable over Coleman in view of Redford and further in view of Kurii (U.S. Patent 4,429,368). That rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Official Action relies upon Coleman and Redford to teach or suggest the limitations of amended claims 1 and 6, from which claims 4 and 9 respectively depend. Accordingly, the propriety of the rejection of claims 4 and 9 depends upon the propriety of the rejection of amended claims 1 and 6. Because the rejection of amended claims 1 and 6 is erroneous, and because Kurii fails to teach or suggest those limitations of amended claims 1 and 6 absent from Coleman and Redford, the rejection of claims 4 and 9 is also erroneous and should be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 10 were rejected as unpatentable over Coleman in view of Redford and further in view of Clarisse (U.S. Patent 5,247,651). That rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Official Action relies upon Coleman and Redford to teach or suggest the limitations of amended claims 1 and 6, from which claims 5 and 10 respectively depend. Accordingly, the propriety of the rejection of claims 5 and 10 depends upon the propriety of the rejection of amended claims 1 and 6. Because the rejection of amended claims 1 and 6 is erroneous, and because Clarisse fails to teach or suggest those limitations of amended claims 1 and 6 absent from Coleman and Redford, the rejection of claims 5 and 10 is also erroneous and should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections, as well as prompt allowance of the pending claims, are appropriate and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



A. Wesley Ferree, Reg. No. 51,312
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-3960
(202) 737-6770 (telephone)
(202) 737-6776 (facsimile)

Date: 12/2/03